# UNITY

*FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION*


Temporary Barriers to International Co-operation - - *Frank S. Harwood*

War and Women - - - *Ellen Horop*

The Fifth Horseman - *Alice Marston Seaman*

To Stifle Is Not to Solve - *Gilbert Oberweiser*

The Blind in the Economic World - *Betty Hirsch*



VOLUME CXVI NUMBER 5

Chicago, November 4, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

# UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

*Published Semi-Monthly* *Subscription $3.00*
*Until Further Notice* *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
*"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*



*Board of Directors*

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

*Editorial Contributors*

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

*Poetry Editors*

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

*Foreign Representatives*

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH


## Contents


EDITORIAL—

Notes ..... 83
Retaliation—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE ..... 86
Jottings—J. H. H. ..... 86

ARTICLES—

War!—*Montaigne* ..... 83
To Stifle Is Not to Solve—GILBERT OBERWEISER ..... 90
Temporary Barriers to International Co-operation—FRANK S. HARWOOD ..... 87
The Fifth Horseman—ALICE MARSTON SEAMAN ..... 93
The Blind in the Economic World—BETTY HIRSCH ..... 93
War and Women—ELLEN HOROP ..... 95

POETRY—

Fifth Avenue Speaks on Armistice Day!—RUTH JACOBY ..... 92
This Year in Flanders' Fields—ELSIE BAKER ARGOW ..... 92
Thoughts on Rome and Geneva—R. A. REYNOLDS ..... 92
Death Comes at Noon—HART WALKER ..... 95

THE STUDY TABLE—

Russia Today, What We Can Learn from It—TARAKNATH DAS ..... 96
Conquistador—ROBERT C. SCHALLER ..... 97

CORRESPONDENCE—

UNITY'S Opposition to War—I—BRENT ALLINSON ..... 97
—II—ROBERT C. SCHALLER ..... 97
Some Reflections on the War Situation—F. S. KINDER ..... 97
A Word to Mussolini—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH ..... 98

THE FIELD—

International Irony—*Nofrontier News Service* ..... 82
Behold Mr. Hearst!—*The Presbyterian Tribune* ..... 82
Prominent Men Forecast Their Stand on War—*The Modern Monthly* ..... 99
Our Debt to the Radical—*The Standard (N. Y.)* ..... 100


## The Field

***"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."***

### International Irony

Soviet Russia stands for peace, condemns imperialist war, organizes, through the Comintern, work against war and fascism. Soviet Russia is selling to Mussolini most of the oil he is using for naval and commercial vessels, and for the Italian armed forces, on the Ethiopian adventure.

Officials of the Union of South Africa have stated that it will never permit the use of its citizens for a foreign war. From the Union of South Africa comes much of the meat being used by Mussolini's invading army.

Canadian statesmen of all parties have decried the march on Abyssinia. The Canadian Pacific ships, Melita and Minnedosa, have been sold to Mussolini to transport troops.

The United States government has passed a neutrality act which prohibits the shipment of war munitions; its spokesmen have decried the piling up of war profits. Our business interests have expressed jubilation over increased production in steel, partly due to export for the Italian army, and over rises in the quantity and prices of scrap iron exports, chiefly sent to Italy, Germany and Japan.

Great Britain deplores Mussolini's aircraft and their menacing operations with Ethiopia in mind. Britain's official representatives at the disarmament conference killed a plan to ban aerial bombardment of colonial peoples; and, according to House of Commons documents, government officials issued during the six months ending about August 1 permits for 26 airplane flights of Italian planes over British Somaliland.—*Nofrontier News Service.*

### Behold Mr. Hearst!

In order that a fair judgment may be made of the policies advocated by Mr. Hearst the American people ought to know something of the tremendous economic power of this man. A thorough survey in *Fortune* magazine for October makes clear that Mr. Hearst is one of the richest men in America, his financial strength being well over $200,000,000. The way in which he is

(*Continued on Page* 98)

# UNITY

*"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"*

Volume CXVI MONDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1935 No. 5

**WAR!**

**"Oh, monstrous War! Others work without, this inwardly and against herself, and with her own venom gnaweth and consumes herself. It is of so ruinous and malign a nature that together with all things else, she ruineth herself, and with spiteful rage, doth rend, deface and massacre herself. We do more often see it, by and through herself, to waste, to desolate and dissolve herself, than by or through want of any necessary thing, or by enemies' force. All manner of discipline doth shun and fly it. She cometh to cure sedition, and herself is thoroughly therewith infected. She goeth about to chastise disobedience, and showeth the example of it, and being employed for the defense of laws, entereth into actual rebellion against her own ordinances. Aye me, where are we? Our physic bringeth infection."**

**(Montaigne: Essay on Physiognomy.)**

---

The action of the League of Nations in this Italian-Ethiopian business moves one to mingled emotions. On the one hand is the fact that the League is at last vindicating its self-respect, living up to its principles, and doing something in that cause of peace which it was presumably established to serve. This stirs the heart to gladness, and a sense of infinite relief. But then comes the cynical thought that the League of Nations has had chances to act in this way many times before, and has never done so. There was the Vilna case, for example, and Japan's rape of Manchuria, to say nothing of the disgraceful record of disarmament. Why did the League have to wait for Italy before discovering that it had a responsibility for the peace and order of the world? Can it be possible that Great Britain has an interest in this case which has not existed in other cases, and that the League of Nations is really being used to serve the cause of British imperialism as affected by Italy's invasion of a territory which touches the Red Sea, Egypt, and the Nile? There is something more than ample reason for believing that Mussolini in this campaign of his is not really concerned with Abyssinia as his main objective. What we have here is in reality a first step toward a revival of the empire of the Caesars which will envelop the Mediterranean Sea, swallow up north Africa, and eventually penetrate to India. See the article in the October 16th issue of the *Nation* for a statement of this case! If British statesmen believe this, then their action in Geneva is in defense of their own empire, and the League is being used, in characteristic British fashion, to cloak imperial designs with the familiar garb of humanity and civilization. It is this fact which throws a cloud, as it were, over all the Genevan sky. It befogs the whole issue of sanctions and of peace. In doubt as to just what is going on in these tangled and half-hidden maneuvers, we may well cling the faster to our policy of American neutrality. Let not this country be used to serve England against Italy as once it was used to serve England against Germany!

---

We are frank to confess that we are not clear in our mind upon this sanctions business. What is the difference between economic and military sanctions? We are sure that the pacifist cannot support military sanctions, for such sanctions are simply war under another name. But are not economic sanctions war, too, or at least the initial step towards military sanctions and thus toward war itself? Or are these economic sanctions a substitute for war—the positive policy which a pacifist must adopt if he is not to be an utterly negligible influence for peace in such a crisis as now confronts the world? The general question, as thus stated, is confusing. We get some help as we try to translate the question into concrete terms. Thus, we see with single eye the proposition that a belligerent nation, such as Italy today, should be shut off absoutely from loans and credits. Not one cent should be granted her for war purposes by either public or private sources! This is an economic sanction, we believe, which every peace-lover should support. On the other hand, a blockade of the ports of Italy by the English fleet, for the cutting off of trade and commerce, seems to us not only dangerous but wrong. If an economic sanction, then this is also a war measure such as is immediately resorted to when war itself has come. Here are two extremes, both of which present clear issues *pro* and *con*, and the line between them, so far as we can see it, pertains to the utilization of *force*. If the League of Nations or any other power, for peace or any other good purpose, is going to resort to force, either latent or active, then we are opposed to it, economic sanctions or no economic sanctions. But if the League can find ways and means of action which will involve not force but a legitimate and effective

withdrawal of aid and comfort from the aggressor, then we are for it. This is what economic sanctions really mean—not attack in any form, but *outlawry*—denial of contact, communication, cooperation! Sanctions as thus interpreted we approve.

---

Christopher Morley announces a remarkable discovery in old Dr. Johnson's famous story of "Rasselas." This was originally, it will be remembered, the tale of "The Prince of Abyssinia." It was this fact, we surmise, that turned Mr. Morley back to the old classic, and started him speculating about that name, Rasselas, in relation to the name of the modern Emperor Selassie. It seems that Ras is an Abyssinian title, as Ras Seyoum and Ras Makonnen, and this immediately suggests to Mr. Morley's ingenious mind that Rasselas should really be Ras Selas—which means, perhaps, that Johnson's hero is in reality a forebear of Haile Selassie. But we have still to refer to Mr. Morley's discovery of a passage in the old masterpiece which has a timeliness at this moment which is uncanny, not to say terrifying. We search our minds in vain for any parallel to match this piece of prophecy:

"If all men were virtuous," returned the artist, "I should with great alacrity teach them all to fly. But what would be the security of the good, if the bad could at pleasure invade them from the sky? Against an army sailing through the clouds, neither walls, nor mountains, nor seas, could afford any security. A flight of northern savages might hover in the wind, and light at once, with irresistible violence, upon the capital of a fruitful region, that was rolling under them. Even this valley, the retreat of princes, the abode of happiness, might be violated."

This was written, mind you, nearly a century before Tennyson's amazing line in his "Locksley Hall" about "airy navies" dropping down "a ghastly dew." Dr. Johnson not only forecasts the art of flying and the use of flying machines in war, but actually foresees a situation in which a remote and inaccessible country is exposed to attack through the air and perhaps destroyed. And this country, in the book as now in the living world, is *Abyssinia!* Simeon Strunsky, commenting on Mr. Morley's article as published in the *Saturday Review of Literature,* declares that it "will be read with interest by the millions of high school boys and girls who found the going through the Johnson text very much what the Italian heavy guns are now experiencing in the Ethiopian hill-country." But these high school youngsters, and their teachers, have been reading "Rasselas" all this time. Why did not one of them discover the passage?

---

The depression still remains a mystery, as we have said more than once in these perplexed columns. Business is improving, we are told, and has been improving for some months. Statistics from various sources seem to prove this. Thus, chain store and department store sales are "up." More impressive still, corporation dividends are increasing steadily over a year ago. The automobile industry speaks for itself, and even the railroads are cheerful. But here comes the report of the Treasury Department on revenue receipts in the new fiscal year beginning July 1st last, and they are "down" as compared with those of a year ago. President Roosevelt, all optimism as usual, has told us that revenues would rise in this new fiscal year not less than $670,000,000, and in this prophecy he had the backing of the Treasury. But now Washington reports that between July 1st and October 15th of this present year, revenues amounted to $1,120,192,388, as compared with $1,121,363,496 in the corresponding period of 1934. This shows a falling off of $1,171,108, which indicates a net loss for the fiscal year of $4,015,224. This is not a large sum in these days of astronomical figures in government operations, but it shows conclusively that the President's promise of revenues totaling $4,470,349,140, or 23 per cent greater than the revenues of the last fiscal year, is only one more little pipe-dream. But the serious thing is that these revenues, actually collected from income and trade, do not confirm the indications that industrial conditions are improving. On the contrary, they seem to reveal that we are still on the down grade. How to explain this paradox we do not know. Nor do we get any help at all from expert economists and financiers, who seem to be as hopelessly at sea as "the three wise men of Gotham." So we fling up our hands, count our pennies, and resume the business of trying to keep our own personal affairs going for a while longer.

---

This is interesting news from Hamilton College that it has refused the grant of money from the federal government for the education of so many young men now carried on relief. The college has no objection to the young men, but has serious objections to becoming financially dependent upon Washington. Along with this surprising news comes the word from Chicago that churches in that city have turned down an offer of the government to give them hundreds of thousands of dollars to carry on educational and public welfare work suspended during the depression. These churches think it unwise to be subsidized—they see the beginning at least of a violation of the established principle of separation of church and state. It seems too bad, when Washington is spending money like the traditional drunken sailor, that some of this money should not pass into such worthy hands as those of college and church. But what about the independence of these institutions? What is the end of this business of getting anybody and everybody to take sustenance from the federal govern-

ment? With billions of dollars at its disposal, what is to prevent the administration putting us all under subvention to its whims and fancies? About colleges we know little, and hence have little right to speak. But about churches we know a good deal, and we say that to sit at the receipt of customs and there seek gifts, or appropriations, or endowments from the state is to prepare for spiritual death. The churches are entangled closely enough now with our existing capitalistic order, without being tied up to the government which is the administrator of this order. The problem of organized religion today is already that of rescuing it from its almost complete dependence upon the money interests which dominate our existing social system. Let not this problem be aggravated by turning the churches into paid agents of the political machine. The Chicago churches have acted in time. The approach of the New Deal was enticing and therefore insidious. It challenged a new application of the old prayer, "Lead us not into temptation!"

---

Are the German churches surrendering to the Hitler government? A despatch in the New York *Times* would indicate as much. It will be remembered (see the last issue of UNITY) that a recent decree of Hitler placed the churches absolutely under the dominance of the state through the operations of a directorate ruled by Hanns Kerrl, Minister of Church Affairs. This fatal pill was sugar-coated by the retirement of the hated Reichsbishop Mueller, and more especially by the offer to the Confessional Christians of representation of opposition church pastors in the directorate. Hitler's insistence upon the abject and complete surrender of the churches to the state inevitably dictated the repudiation of this new program. But now we are told that the German clergy have reached "a temporary compromise." Thus, at a meeting of the Reich Brotherhood Council of Confessional Synods in Berlin, it was voted that (1) the Synods were opposed in principle to the idea of state supremacy and therefore to the project of a government-appointed church directorate in any form, but that (2) in case such a directorate was formed, the Council would accept representation on the directorate, and believed that it should have a majority of the seats. What this means is, or should be, obvious. It is as though a group of total abstainers should say, We are opposed to drinking, but if the booze is going 'round, we'll take our share; as though a group of political reformers should declare, We are opposed to graft, but if you're going to steal anyway, let's have part of the swag; as though a group of pacifists should say, We are opposed to war, but if war comes, we'll enlist and fight and kill! This compromise, if carried out, simply means that Hitler has won his fight, and that the churches are completely suppressed. It is heartening to read that the Prussian opposition clergy were not in favor of this compromise formula; but it is utterly disheartening to read, in the same despatch, that the compromise was adopted "to prevent southern German bishops from abandoning the Confessional church and going over to the government." It is further stated that these bishops have received promise of immunity from further interference, and "are supported by a large group of neutral clergy who are only mildly opposed to state supremacy." It looks bad!

---

How does fate punish us with our own misdeeds! Take Fifth Avenue, New York, for example! This was once the most beautiful residential street in America. From Washington Square to Central Park it ran straight as an arrow, broad as a boulevard, lined on either side with noble homes and lordly churches. Then business came in to spoil the picture and ruin the neighborhood. First, high-toned shops catering to the most exclusive trade; then the great department stores of the metropolis; then banks and trust companies, restaurants and tea-rooms! Did the residents of Fifth Avenue desire this invasion? They did not. They tried feverishly, frantically, fruitlessly to stop it. They even went so far as to appeal to the government for a city ordinance to forbid it. But all in vain! Business came in, and the homes were torn down or stood untenanted. Progress, we are told, must have its way. Now, watch progress having its way! There came the time, not so long ago, when business not so high-toned began to show its head on Fifth Avenue, now the finest business street in the world. We remember the day when Woolworth opened his first 5 and 10 cent store on the Avenue—what a sensation, and what a protest! Then on another day came the first Childs Restaurant. Steadily through the years a cheaper and ever cheaper line of trade invaded the neighborhood. The exclusive shops began to move—to upper Madison Avenue and to Park Avenue. The jewelers became nervous and flighty. Even the great department stores and banks began to ponder. At last, with the depression, shops suddenly became empty. Bankruptcy sales, with their flaring posters, were not uncommon. Then, crawling from the darker areas of the city life, came strange creatures who seized upon whatever locations they could get and straightway launched the most disreputable fly-by-night types of merchandising. Now the business men are howling—and, like the residents whom they ousted a few years ago, are rushing to the city hall for protective ordinances. But it's too late—the Avenue is gone. What we have in this cycle of evolution is the old familiar story of American competitive business, the cut-throat struggle for profits. But why call it *progress?*

## Retaliation

The children's game of Tit-for-tat soon becomes a wearisome sport, and the children abandon it out of sheer boredom. Or else, it turns into a broil which can be quelled only by parental interference.

To some natures vengeance is sweet because it gives them the sadistic joy of seeing its victim suffer. It soon palls upon more healthy natures because of its patent futility. What is gained by exacting vengeance? The miscreant is restrained by fear from continuing his evil practices? But who wants to live with people against whose attacks fear is the only restraint!

An ethical and social policy of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, if carried to its logical conclusion, would give us a blind and toothless population. Once started upon a program of exacting the precise equivalent from those who have committed wrongs, the only possible end is social chaos.

Those who insist upon justice though the heavens fall usually get accommodated: the heavens fall and overwhelm them along with the rest. One of the most pathetic spectacles in all history or legend is a blind Samson pulling down the pillars of the temple to crush his enemies, in the certainty that the roof will fall also upon him.

Many a soldier has won glory in selling his life dearly, when he must die, by a mighty slaughter of the enemy, but his achievement is glorious only on the principle that a great cause profited by his sacrifice. A vindictive lashing out to kill, merely to kill in the last extremity, never won anybody worthy fame.

Outrages have been committed in Germany. If the stories current are half true, atrocities have been enacted under official sanction or without effective official restraint, which offend every sense of humanity. What shall be done about this?

The first question to ask is, What is the end to be gained by whatever may be done? Is the aim the softening of the woes of those who have been set upon? Then precisely the way not to achieve that end is to organize vindictive demonstrations in other lands, to press boycotts against all German goods, to tear down German flags wherever they are seen flying, boisterously to propose the severing of all diplomatic relations with the German nation, and to engage in similar practices whose inevitable effect is to consolidate German public opinion behind the policy of oppression and injustice.

The one effective policy which has been adopted in meeting the situation created by the German atrocities, alleged and real, is the organized international relief service for the German refugees. All the rest has tended to aggravate the miseries and deepen the woes of those remaining in Germany who fall under the lash of the popular or official fury.

Those who find life in Germany intolerable may well be helped to get out and find congenial social relations elsewhere. Those who wish to continue to live in Germany wish most of all to establish and retain relations with their neighbors on some viable basis. The last thing which such need, and doubtless the last which many of them desire, is to have their neighbors' sentiments lashed into fury by distant futile attempts at vengeance in their behalf. Many a prayer must go up from the distressed in Germany, "Lord, save us from the follies of our friends!"

A just society is possible only as a community modus vivendi is established and cordially maintained. The cleaving of each national unit into irreconcilable factions through international organization of these factions into vindictive political or economic or racial parties or cartels or race groups is a counsel of futility, of injustice, and of ultimate social chaos.

To cut one's self off from social relations with the obnoxious is often highly desirable. That is measurably possible in some human relationships. But to refuse to live in the same world with a great and populous nation is a futility which does not appeal to the intelligent; to remove to some other world, or to insist that the obnoxious neighbor shall take up residence elsewhere, involves embarrassments too great to be faced.

We all have to live in this world, and lashing out in vindictive and impotent fury against obnoxious neighbors is not the way to make this world livable. Retaliation does not vindicate justice; it compounds injustice.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

---

## Jottings

"Rome, Oct. 10.—Diplomatic relations between Italy and Ethiopia have been broken. . . . Afework Jesus, Ethiopian Charge d'Affaires, was given his passport today and was expected to leave today.—*United Press despatch.*

There is a profound parable in this dispatch. When war breaks out, Jesus is always "given his passport" and "expected to leave."

---

Automobile deaths in 1934 numbered 33,980, as compared with 29,323 in 1933—an increase of 15 per cent. The year 1934 was the first full year of Repeal. Is this a coincidence, or a true example of cause and effect?

---

Has speed become insanity with us? We thought so the other day when, in a New York department store, we saw *streamline baby-carriages* for sale.

---

A correspondent of *Zion's Herald* asks a reader to "read two books, Stanley Jones' 'Christ's Alternative to Communism' and Herbert Hoover's 'Challenge

to Liberty'." Anybody who reads these books, in this fashion, will have the same trouble in his mind that an old uncle of ours once had in his stomach when he took two Seidlitz powders—one right *after* the other!

---

"Haile Selassie Orders Holy War."
New York *Herald-Tribune.*

We wonder what "holy war" means? It sounds like "sacred murder," or "sanctified adultery."

The late Arthur Henderson supported the Great War, while Ramsay MacDonald broke with him in opposition as a steadfast pacifist. Now MacDonald is member of a militarist Tory Cabinet, and Henderson died the leader of the Disarmament Conference and winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace. The whirligig of time!

J. H. H.

---

## Temporary Barriers to International Co-operation

World affairs are so great and complicated that it is almost presumption to lift a voice regarding them. But the difficulties that face us will be smoothed away only by the interchange of ideas and by co-operation of effort. Therefore, let every thinker who can offer a little more enlightenment and a bit of encouragement speak before it is too late.

Surely not since 1914 have sabers rattled more threateningly than at present. For most of us the recollection of that date causes what we hear now to fill us with dread. The hopes of peace on earth grow dim, and we wonder if man really can outgrow the practice of war.

But we are not surprised at the turn of events. The hatreds generated by the World War are coming to fruition and must find expression. The professional militarists have new guns and would like to try them. The war babies cannot realize what their fathers suffered in the trenches, so to those babies who have become the conscripted youth of to-day a new war sounds like an adventure. The executives who hold the destiny of nations in their hands are not yet convinced that war is too expensive to be tolerated. Worst of all, the munitions makers, the only ones whose profits never cease, are all for war, and it will be indeed something new if their desires are not fulfilled as usual.

Beyond doubt the advocates of permanent peace are more numerous to-day than ever before, which makes their apparent ineffectiveness all the more pathetic. The voice of Abbe de St. Pierre in 1713, after the universal fighting of that age, with its "Plan for Lasting Peace," sounds lonely compared with the extensive anti-war outcry of our time. The worshipers of Mars laughed aloud in 1815 at Czar Alexander's "Holy Alliance" pledging its members to fight each other no more. But the peace idea has grown, and in the late nineteenth century plan followed plan to settle international disputes by arbitration. Men really thought the spears would be turned into pruninghooks and the swords into plowshares. Then in 1914 a shot at Sarajevo shook down the peace castles as if they had been made of cards, and peace lovers of nearly every description learned to curse each other and blast each other to pieces in the name of God.

We have lived to see many groups in the past few years denounce and renounce war. Church councils, certain ministers, college students, and others have in varying degrees stated their severance from support of any future fightings between nations. Their words sound impressive, but unfortunately the war lords remember similar assertions of other days and how little they meant or accomplished. The protests against internecine strife will have to be more numerous than they are, and a real majority will have to *prove* that they are forever done with the folly of brotherly killing before the big guns will be spiked, and remember that the proof can come only in another war! It is a fact too well known for argument that once the firing has started all reasonableness takes flight and there can be no end to the contest except by brute force.

All this being true, what hope can there be now or ever? Strange as the suggestion may seem, a consideration of past wars portends the ultimate discontinuance of war.

Think of Germany, the very nation which has thrown the peace machinery of the world out of gear, or at least has subjected it to a supreme test. Surely Germany might be called a barrier to international co-operation at this time. But the story of that nation is encouraging. Follow this thought for what it is worth: In 1815 there was no such German unity as we know it. After the Napoleonic wars had ended, Prussia almost reopened them because she wished to seize Saxony as a punishment to their king for aiding Napoleon against Prussia! Germans fighting Germans! In 1866 the south German nations fought on the side of Austria against Prussia, and in 1870 France dared attack Prussia because she hoped those south German nations would aid France on account of their disaffection to Prussia. However, France was sadly mistaken, for all the Germans had decided to stand together, and from that day the former narrow loyalties of various German states to themselves were welded into a loyalty to all Germany. That was, of course, the birth of the Empire. Who will say that the very spirit of nationalism which now isolates this people may not, by some unforeseen set of circumstances, bring them into equally intense adherence to world co-operation?*

It is well known that England and Scotland fought each other for hundreds of years. Robert Bruce became a national hero to the Scotch because he defeated the British at Bannockburn. If there were souls then who deplored the endless strife, they must have looked with dread into a dark future. Yet the disputes passed away and, while a Scotchman may not care to be called an Englishman, still he has no idea of raising up another Bruce to fight the English. These two people, with all their different qualities, are wholeheartedly attached to the United Kingdom. A larger loyalty has supplanted the ones which could not live in peace.

All the nations of the world have been growing up through the centuries by this same process, and it would be shortsighted indeed to assume that their present condition is full maturity. It is not a wild invention of the imagination to believe that narrow nationalism as expressed by the habit of war is a temporary barrier to international co-operation. Certainly if any reliance may be placed upon developments along this line in the

*What has been written here about Germany can be applied also to Italy.—F. S. H.

past, the advocates of arbitration should take heart, even though another world war comes.

The matter of tariffs on imported goods is still almost a universal hindrance to international trade. Tariffs are imposed to protect a nation's standard of living, and because goods are made as much for profit as for use, if not more so. If there were no tariffs, people of one land would be thrown out of work by the influx of cheap goods from another where the people labor for almost nothing. If there were no tariffs, the profits made by investors in nations with higher standards of living would be seized by investors in nations with lower standards. A moment's thought reveals that the aim of all this is not to protect the welfare of all the people but just of those within the confines of a certain region. However, in some realms tariffs have been abandoned. To revert to Germany, there was a time when the German states charged one another duties on interstate shipments. Then they leveled down the barriers, to the loss and discomfort of certain industries, but the final result was, so far as the German nation is concerned, a leveling up of their standard of living.

But we do not need to go to Germany for our illustration. Before we succeeded in making a constitution and a United States government, our American colonies had the most disastrous interstate relations. Goods passing from one colony to another were penalized with high tariffs, and more than once colonies were at the point of war over this. Who can imagine the confusion and retardation that might have continued here had our ancestors not wisely placed in the national constitution a clause absolutely prohibiting tariffs between states in restraint of trade? But for this prohibition New Jersey, to take an example, would be partly surrounded by patrol boats turning back would-be smugglers of everything competing with Jersey-made goods. Every bridge would be guarded and every car searched before crossing the line. Have we seen traffic jams at the Hudson ferries and bridges and tunnels? They are picnics compared with the jams that would occur if tariffs were permitted and adopted. Because nations which were formerly deadlocked within themselves by local border duties have forever discarded them is not a proof that international free trade will eventually prevail, or that it might be desirable, but no one will deny that this progress has been made and that regional financial benefit has resulted from it. Even if it is impossible as things now are to figure out what kind of a world situation would justify universal free trade, we are no more in the dark regarding that than were our German and American ancestors before those nations came into being.

Both wars and tariffs are problems on a bigger scale now than ever before, but the history of their elimination in certain fields encourages us to hope that this narrow nationalism as shown by them is a temporary barrier to international co-operation.

One of the greatest obstacles to goodwill between nations is the struggle for markets. It has caused innumerable wars and will cause more. The whole grim story of European colonies in the Americas, Africa, India, China and elsewhere is based on that grasping for buyers. The English against the Dutch, the English against the French, the English and French against the Russians, the French against the Germans, the Japanese against the Russians, war, war, war, markets, colonies, trade—it is all one bloody story. And now who should arise to compete with and outsell all the world but Japan! The European nations which thought that the trade in Europe and nearly everywhere else was theirs to grab from each other awake to find that while they count their unhatched chicks Japan steals the eggs! This is the most fundamental matter of dispute on earth. Trade is the life of a nation, and all that a nation has will it give for its life. At least, so England thought when she fought to retain her American colonies. But other arrangements had to be made than what she planned, and the business world did not come to an end either.

The imposition of tariffs and the struggle for markets are manifestations of a provincialism which is perfectly natural now but which must surely disappear when the truth is finally realized that the good of some can only be secured through the good of all. The past affords us little in the matter of markets from which to draw enlightenment. About all we can say is that nations have sometimes agreed on restricted areas, one nation monopolizing this region for business and another that region, but at best it is an artificial plan. The latest device is our own by which agricultural producers are paid to cut down production in order through scarcity to create a market at home. Fields of growing cotton have been plowed under, breeding hogs butchered and converted into fertilizer, and so on *ad nauseam,* until he who would argue that goods in this country are produced primarily for use rather than for profit is greatly embarrassed.

Nations have never in history shown more determination to save themselves from each other's encroachments. And that just when many eager seekers for a better world were expecting a sensible internationalism! When man has learned to produce what he needs so plentifully that hard times should be an unheard of thing he proceeds to destroy a large part of his abundance to raise the price! When business could flow quickly to every spot on earth through the marvelous transportation facilities, man puts up tariff barriers to keep back the ships and trains! At a time when the storehouses are bursting with too much, the largest number of unemployed in history cannot earn a penny with which to buy! When the world is burdened with suffering and unparalleled debts as the result of the World War, the war clouds with muttering thunders are darkening the skies! What does it all mean? Why such behavior, most of which seems so unaccountable?

We might clarify our thoughts somewhat by laying down as an axiom the fact that nations are always trying to do the best thing for themselves. No doubt they are justified in looking out for their own welfare. It is too much to expect nations to be very altruistic, however much individuals may profess that philosophy.

When Saxony fought Prussia she must have thought it was the best course to pursue, even if they were all Germans. When Scotland resisted England in sanguinary battles they thought national Scotch independence was the most important matter. But time has put a different face on everything. Now Saxony and Wurtemburg and Bavaria feel that it is better to be a part of a greater nation of Germany than to fight among themselves. Now Scotland feels that a share in the United Kingdom is better for them than national isolation. The American colonies thought it was to their own advantage to tax goods crossing the colony lines. No matter if it did hinder trade and bring them to the verge of war, it protected home industries and was for their own good, they thought. But now we know that freedom from tariffs in all this great land results in universal benefit to our people. The meaning of the word

"home" as applied to industries has become greatly enlarged. The Germans, the Scotch, and the Americans were as sincere then as now in reverse position. Judging by these experiences it is not unreasonable to think that some day all the nations in Europe and the world will recognize that their own greatest good is secured by sacrificing some minor rights to world organization.

The nations are trembling on the brink of war again, and whether there is actual strife this year or later it is certain to come, unless a miracle happens. One force is holding off the war for a time and that is fear. They fear not so much one another as they fear the collapse of the whole present order. The example of what took place in Russia in 1917 stands as a spectre before them. Dare the executives place upon the taxpayers an additional unbearable burden? These executives know full well that such a procedure might unseat those who have capitalized on the masses in past wars. It is with them a question of to be or not to be. This fear may not, however, be sufficiently strong to hold the war dogs in leash. One cannot tell what the force of habit may do. Europe has the war habit and it is hard to break. North America is not quite so cursed with this habit, though a little matter of history will show how nearly we came to perpetuating here that evil. At the time of the War of 1812 we had forty-six forts along our side of the St. Lawrence, and Canada faced us with an equal or greater number. The Great Lakes were reddened with the blood of brothers fighting for rights on the seas. Later some military officials urged the government at Washington to supply money for more forts and battleships against Canada. Richard Rush, a young Quaker official at Washington, received the request and, instead of passing it along favorably, he talked with the ambassador from Great Britain on the subject. The consequence was an agreement by which all forts and battleships on the Canadian border were removed. For more than a hundred years we have abstained from the war habit with Canada and Great Britain. And so at this point of the compass the desire and practice of peace are rather strong.

The Far East was pacific for centuries until Europe taught it the arts of militarism. In order to sell the superabundance of manufactured goods, Europe a century or less ago bombarded the ports of China and Japan into the notion of buying European goods, and also by that showed them the apparent virtue of the force of arms. Now the boomerang is turning back on the thrower and one of the greatest questions today is what will the Far East do? Can Europe get out of the habit of fighting? Even if the process of evolution were far enough along so we could believe this, the Far East with its world trade and military aspirations checks disarmament in Europe.

Perhaps this war habit will be broken only in the downfall of the entire capitalist system. To say this is to risk being classified as a dry-mouthed calamity howler. Let us then admit that the outlook is usually not really so bad as it seems. Where no hope appears there is hope just the same. But a serious consideration of the results of the last World War convinces the fairminded person that another major military struggle between the nations would certainly not strengthen a system which cannot preserve peace. For whatever it is worth, in this connection, we should recall that Russia, the only non-capitalist nation, is the only nation which has repeatedly offered to disarm completely if other nations would do likewise. What will follow in the wake of another war no one can predict—perhaps communism, perhaps something else, but anyway something in revolt. Maybe it will take just so great a calamity to usher in a regime where men will learn to produce for use rather than for the enrichment of a few. Should this occur then the tariffs and trade snatchings which at present seem so insoluble would fade out of the picture in a most surprising way. Does this sound fanciful and far-fetched? Yet for nations to go on forever trying to revive themselves by living in airtight compartments shut off from international trade, and trying to save themselves by building top-heavy military defenses costing more than all other expenses put together, and ignoring the fact that the greatest good for each nation is inextricably knit together with the greatest good for all nations is likewise unthinkable.

We have seen the expression of narrow nationalism in wars and tariffs disappear from increasingly larger regions as people have learned a better way of protecting their welfare. It is not safe to assume that the process is going to continue of its own momentum to a final state of world peace and co-operation, though there is some basis for such a belief. But back of each advance there has been a person or persons guiding the movement with far-seeing plans: a Bismarck uniting Germany (however questionable his methods), a Madison fathering our constitution, and a Woodrow Wilson with his League of Nations (imperfect though it be).

Two major forces will finally bring about the necessary international co-operation: the teachings of those altruistic prophets who seek what is good for the whole world, and the self-centered efforts of the nationalists who are equally anxious to secure what is best for themselves. After all what is best for human beings is the same whether it is arrived at from the point of view of the altruist or of the self-centered. The difference is that the heart capacity of the altruist is great enough to include all mankind instead of only a part. He is farther along the road, and the nationalist will some day catch up.

These two forces may be personified in the pacifist and the militarist, at opposite extremes. The pacifist rises above the limited motives by which the general run of people seek their own good and shows the ideal of world brotherhood. But he cannot quickly solve our problem because the world is not yet run chiefly on the basis of looking out for everyone's good. The militarist is determined to protect those near and dear to him at the expense of those not so near. As long as the militarist has the commanding word he will continue to be the determining factor. Recognizing the undeniable fact that he is for war because without war he would be without a job, still we should admit that he is for war since he really thinks it is the best way to protect the welfare of his little section of earth's population. This is the most charitable view that can be taken of the militarist and all his kind.

To say that the military method will be continued because the munitions makers wish to be enriched thereby is to accuse the nations of selling their souls. And there has been guilt in this respect. To say it will continue because the rulers do not know it will result in financial and moral bankruptcy is to accuse them of mental denseness. We do see amazing stupidity. To say the leaders of the world realize wars will bring ruin but cannot stop them is equally damning.

Ours is the most advanced age of history for at last the munitions makers and all their benighted and can-

cerous associates are being revealed by the clear light of unsparing investigation. The hitherto inarticulate sentiment of the world's honest masses will rise in hot wrath and demand the complete elimination of these inhuman parasites. It is the most advanced age for more and more of the people are coming to realize what a catastrophe hangs over us if the blood and iron policy among nations is not soon discarded forever. It is not a question whether wars will finally end but of how they will end. It is certain that no sensible person will ever again be deceived into joining another war to end war. Like burned children we have learned our lesson there. Perhaps the present powder magazine in which we find ourselves imprisoned will be set off by some foolish move and all the preventive efforts be blasted to smithereens. Or possibly the sounder judgment of the peace pioneers may lead us out of the immediate danger to continual goodwill among peoples. But whatever comes, whether catastrophe or early peace, the final result will be a reproduction on a world scale of the process which has been taking place within nations in the past, namely, the enlargement of the circle of brotherhood.

In conclusion, a sustaining hope of permanent peace on earth is founded on an economic basis because it pays, on the assurance that the world will at last see beyond a shadow of a doubt what it evidently does not yet fully see that wars cost infinitely more than they are worth. When this is the commonly accepted truth fighting between nations will go the way every other uneconomical thing has gone.

FRANK S. HARWOOD.

---

## To Stifle Is Not to Solve

Early last spring, after a season of anti-radical campaigning and red-baiting by Hearst, Michigan passed a sedition bill. But the challenge to free speech penetrated many other states besides Michigan, although it did not penetrate the others with such serious results. Every paper under Hearst's command, scattered from coast to coast, loudly demanded the blood of the radicals. For a while during the drive there was a great stir in some of the universities as senatorial bloodhounds, lashed on by the "candid exposure of Communistic activities," went about trying to smell out Communist instructors. And every person interested in the American social scene could not help being touched in some way or other by the blatant propaganda which was so loud and challenging.

About the time the drive was in its hottest stage, I began going about trying to get into conversation with people about the matter of the anti-radical campaign which was threatening all radical ideas and opinions "no matter what degree or color." I wanted to feel out, if possible, what people thought about the threat, how they felt about it, and what emotions, if any, stirred within them as they read the propaganda.

Since I had no means of talking with everybody, my conversations were confined to my college acquaintances, near-acquaintances and their acquaintances, and whomever else I could find.

From the strangers I conversed with I found one thing standing out above others: that, on the whole, they distrusted the source from which the propaganada came, or else openly scoffed at the red-baiting. There were exceptions, of course. I remember that one very neatly dressed business man praised the local Hearst editor for his blatancy in downing the radicals. But there were more who did not take an interest in the matter at all, who stared at me blankly as if they didn't know what the matter was all about, or who impatiently cast the matter aside as something unimportant.

But among college students, and former students and graduates who had not been able to find work during the depression but who took an interest in the social movements which they saw would determine the kind of world they would have to live in, I found rebellion against the threats. Failure to find decent employment after they had finished their schooling had already embittered some of them. The *status quo* meant only prolonged misery to them. Hence, for Hearst to threaten all the challengers of the *status quo* and to imply through the mouthpiece of his press that everybody must think only in the way he wanted them to think (his own special "American" way) was odious to them.

This attitude, however, does not by any means fairly represent the attitude of the masses, who are still very easily led by sensational propaganda. It does not even represent the attitude of all the unemployed and discontented college youth, nor the discontented graduates who have had to take window washing, bellhop and busboy jobs with little or no hope of anything better in the future. But if this depression drags out much longer, how many more will join the ranks of the embittered and the desperate? How about the youths who are now graduating from high school and who will be unable to find work? How fast will this army of discontented grow? And what will their reactions become toward the world in which they can find neither rest nor peace?

Five and six years ago, many of the now unemployed and discontented young people entered college with high ideals, with rampant hopes which they never dreamed would be crushed, with a certain amount of faith in everything about them. To most of them, at that time, the depression which had just begun had yet no chance to bare its fangs and show what a destructive force it was. The intervening time between their graduation from high school and their entrance into college was short—too short to break down their morale, if they had been unsuccessful in finding work during that time. Anyway, getting into industry was not yet their sole aim. A higher education was their main thought. For they looked forward to a better day when they would go out into the world which by that time would be set to welcome them, need them. They always looked to the future—a future of bright and ever-widening possibilities. And the talk of their parents, if they were from the middle or fairly-well-off working class, tended to strengthen this good faith in the future.

Their parents had lived through other "hard times" and depressions during which they had had to pinch and count their pennies. But afterwards there had always come periods of prosperity to

compensate for the loss. They said to each other in the presence of their children, "Ah, this will not last long. In a year or so everything will be all right again." Meanwhile, the press echoed Hoover's famous "prosperity around the corner" phrase, and continued to echo it until everybody nearly believed it.

This was the encouraging send-off which was given the last generation of youths as they boarded their trains for college and what they thought was the realization of their dreams. Then came three, four, or five years of studying, followed by graduation.

Some of their graduation addresses were just as encouraging as their send-offs had been. I heard a few of the addresses myself. The young graduates were told to "go forth and make the world over" as the world was admittedly in a pretty bad way. Only they were not told how unwelcome they would be if they dared to attempt "to make the world over," nor did the great professors ever murmur much about how coldly they would be received when they would be going from place to place in search of work. That was left for the youths to find out for themselves.

After long months of futile effort to find employment, during which they found only that they were unwanted, reactions naturally set in. Things began to appear hopeless. The sense of futility, especially when it is connected with something as important as a future, is an overwhelming thing. Minds are not fortified enough to stand up under this battering without being affected in some way or other. Despair, bitterness, suspicion, frenzy, or passive resignation begin to slowly creep in.

A disillusioned graduate engineer once said to me, "You know, Gib, I'm beginning to feel inferior to other people. I'm beginning to become self-conscious about not having a real job. Sometimes I thing that people who have no education at all, who have no high ideals or goals, are happier than we are. They are contented with anything. They live for nothing except today. They don't expect great things. We expect too much. Sometimes I think that too many of us have overstepped our mark."

Another reaction resulting from the long years of depression is a spirit of bitter hopelessness that has bored its way into the minds of many.

Five of us were sitting in the park one warm spring day when one made an idle remark about the wet spring we were having.

"The rain ought to make things grow nice this year," another said.

Then immediately the oldest in the group—a leathery-faced engineering student, who had come from Colorado—flared, "What difference does it make if we do have an abundant crop? That won't make any difference to us. The people who have the wealth always have enough to eat themselves full. And the rest of the people will continue to be in want as much as ever!"

The tone of his voice was biting and bitter. Nobody in the group argued with him.

A psychological complex which causes persons to think quite sincerely that all capitalists are cunning men who continually scheme devices by which to gain selfish ends, and which further causes them to suspect that every conservative measure is disguised tyranny, is slowly gaining grip. This sounds like Communism. But it is not necessarily this! It is only natural opinion, since such ideas would not germinate if the socio-economic state of affairs were not excellent soil for them to grow in.

Being jobless, then, and sinking deeper and deeper into the mire of despair, is the position in which the last generation of youths, and also many older persons, find themselves. It is not a comfortable position. Neither is it one which was brought about by any doings or misdeeds of their own. Least of all is it one which was brought about by their own choice.

At the same time, these same jobless and despairing men and women have listened hopefully (mostly when it began) to the conservative press periodically hooraying, forecasting, and promising the return of "ye goode olde prosperity." Possibly the press did this optimistic shouting merely to keep up the morale of the public. Maybe the spring warmth and sunshine affected the thinking of the conservative editors, as these bright prophecies always came with the approach of spring.

Anyway, prosperity was always coming with the return of spring. Construction work would somehow miraculously leap to life. Employment would increase. The world would be in its glory. But neither the status of widespread poverty nor the number of unemployed has wavered any appreciable amount.

I remember my own feelings about these optimistic notes of recovery which always turned out to be false. I, too, read the daily papers that continually prophesied "prosperity around the corner." At first I believed the papers, but after a while I became tired of having my hopes all stirred up, only to fall to a lower point than ever later on. During the first three years of the depression, I listened with faith to the encouraging words from men of good community standing whose foresight I trusted and whose opinions I respected. "It can't last long," was their watchword. "Next year it will all be over with." But the next year was always the next, and so on, until to me their optimism took an aspect of wishful thinking and nothing more. I listened to them no more.

A long drawn-out period of darkness, such as this depression, takes overwhelming dimensions, to some persons. Darkness is everywhere. Light is always around a corner. It always seems to remain around the corner—a corner which seems not to exist. They wait. Nothing happens. More waiting. Still nothing happens. The gruesome case of Henry Arden who, before committing suicide, shot up a Chicago relief station last winter where he killed two innocent relief workers, stands saliently as a warning against the extreme psychological disturbances this kind of waiting can bring about.

Now and then little newspaper items add grim testimony to all this. A lifeless body found in a room filled with gas. And there is a note near the body saying that there is nothing in life for a jobless. "Nobody wants me any more," the note reads on. That is all. Another mark is chalked up against the depression.

But what do those of the younger generation

who have seen so many promises of better times fall like so many paper houses before their very eyes, but who yet find too much vigor in themselves to resort to any morbid means of coping with their problems, make of it all?

Their ideas vary, of course, and often they even clash. Many youths who take the social situation seriously are becoming quite convinced that there is something fundamentally wrong with a social order which allows poverty to exist in the midst of plenty. That this paradox has existed before in history makes no difference to them. As a consequence their ideas become tinged—some little, some much—with all kinds of radicalism.

Thus the stage was all set. Millions were unemployed and had been for some time. Many of the youths never had had a chance to work—to do that which they felt they should be doing but which they were powerless to do. Some of these were embittered and were inwardly cursing the intangible thing responsible for their plight. Then in the midst of all this a black threat loomed up from the horizon—a cloud that threatened to make worse what was already bad. "Down wth all radicalism, no matter what shade or color," Hearst's blatant editorials commanded. Soon the patriotic societies of the extreme right wing press joined in on the chorus, and all together made the drive a howling show.

But most of the persons to whom I spoke personally about the matter did not join the blood-seeking orgy. Neither did they cringe before the threats. Some of them accepted the drive as an open challenge to the last right they possessed—the right of freedom of thought and speech. They resented the menace.

One college student described his feeling by simply saying, "It makes me see red!"

A young newspaper man whom I met while riding on a train took the whole situation very coolly. He explained to me that most newspaper men knew the background of the organizations that were spreading this propaganda and took that into account, but he added that it was a shame that much of the public would accept it as the truth.

A university graduate who had been able to find only part-time work told me that reading the stuff caused him bristling resentment. It made him take an offensive stand. Even though he is in no sense a believer in class violence, he said that, for a moment after reading the propaganda, he instantly sympathized with the program of the most extreme Communists and simultaneously accepted Hearst as his bitterest enemy.

Threatening to cut the tongues out of the critics and radicals and calling them "dangerous reds" is no solution of our socio-economic problems at all. Relieve the burden of distress from the shoulders of the despairing, and no one will have to worry about the destruction of our present social system by machine-gun violence, or about the after-reign of a class-conscious dictator.

GILBERT OBERWEISER.

---

### Fifth Avenue Speaks on Armistice Day!

Aurora slowly lifts the shades of night
To let Apollo shed his lustrous light
Upon my royally radiant highway, where
Like a crown of triumph in my hair
Washington Arch reposes. I feel inside
My veins the pulse of heart-beats; a human tide
Comes flowing, filling up my deep ravine
Of lofty towers, swelling like a stream.
I hold along my outstretched arms the most
Luxurious stores, the finest wares. I boast
About my Art Museum where masters dwell,—
Del Sarto, Reynolds, Turner, Constable.
The volumes from my Temple of Delight
Academicians of the world invite
To scan and to unfold their mysteries,
To study and review their histories.
My women, smartly clad, like jewels gleam,
And with beauty and assurance reign supreme.
Then as my busy day draws to a close,
And hurly-burly fades into repose,
I like to watch against the darkling sky,
The Empire State majestically stand by;
I like to see St. Patrick's lacy spires;
Its mellow diapason kindles fires
Within my breast. And in the twilight grey
I see the vestiges of a vanished day.

The night draws on; the fluttering lights go out;
At first a deadly silence, then a shout!
I hear the beat of drums, the tramp of feet,—
Washington and his men,—British defeat.
The drums beat on; that picture starts to fade,
And next I see another great parade.
The drums beat on; and still the legions pass;
My very being throbs to this great mass!
With each drum-beat time passes slowly o'er,—
Processions honoring Dewey, Foch, and more.
Good God! Will these long marches never cease?
Will this long night of war ne'er turn to peace?
And as the cold grey light descends, I plead
With you who love my daytime mood, indeed,
Never to add another war parade to haunt
My nights and make them hollow, grim, and gaunt,
Lest those echoes through the day prevail,
Turn gaiety to grief—lest my heart fail!

RUTH JACOBY.

### This Year in Flanders' Fields

What makes the blooms all colored so
In Flanders' fields where poppies grow?
"For weary years we've tossed in vain,
Our scarlet waves in sun and rain.
Sign of the world we died to see
A joined, unleashed humanity.
Forgotten this for which we died!
Is Mammon still your God and pride
To clog the streets of marching Time . . .
Where is the dream you thought sublime?
It is enough! Ere one more year
You shall awake, or what you fear,
The end of all—is here—is *here!*"
That's why the blooms are colored so
In Flanders' fields where poppies grow. . .

ELSIE BAKER ARGOW.

---

### Thoughts on Rome and Geneva

With beautiful phrases ensnaring
  Laval, Mussolini and Hoare
For a credulous world are preparing
  A lovely new war.

But not till "hostilities cease"
  Shall we learn from the papers, no doubt,
Long after the outbreak of peace
  What the war was about.

In slaughter biographies oozing
  From Cheltenham, Bournemouth and Bath
By senile ex-statesmen now choosing
  Our glorious path.

Or (if none of us then is alive)
  It will prove the Darwinian case
That the generals and statesmen survive
  To continue the race.

R. A. REYNOLDS.

## The Fifth Horseman

The faded red satin marker in the old family bible seemed to be keeping a sacred tryst with some one of my deceased and pious forebears—so long it had lain there—undisturbed—between the heavily embossed covers of that ponderous and venerable heirloom.

The night was cold and blusterous outside—but a bright log blazed upon the hearth, and, as I settled myself comfortably to enjoy a new story, my gaze wandered—irresistibly—to that old book. Somehow—tonight, as never before—the red marker intrigued me. Reaching to the topmost shelf, where it had reposed so long, I procured the volume, and, placing it upon a table near by, opened it at the red marker—Revelation, chapters five and six. Above the latter was a heavy pencil mark,—this chapter, I began to read.

And I saw, and behold! a white horse; and he that sat on him had a bow; and a crown was given unto him: and he went forth conquering, and to conquer.

Yes, I too, had seen this white horse. More than once in my generation he had flashed across the world; —head high—with foaming bit and costly trappings, he had trodden beneath his feet the weak and the helpless. Long ages ago, the shining flanks of this magnificent steed had felt the spurs of the Caesars; for it was they who first implanted within the bosom of the race a thirst for conquest—a dream of empire. The tyrant, Tiberius had ridden this white steed; and Claudius, and Nero—who, by his own hand had ended this cruel line of conquerors. Yet, not long would this horse go riderless: Many generations of culture have gone down under his tread since the passing of the Caesars. Emperor, Kaiser, King and Tsar have ridden him to their downfall, though they still clung fast to the pomp and glitter of this first mighty charger. In the silence of the room, a still small voice whispered to me—"And the name of his rider is *Power*."

Following the white horse came a red and fiery steed, clad in accoutrements of battle. His rider had come forth to take peace from the earth; that men should kill and destroy each other by the sword, and by every means which the skill of man could fashion or that science could discover. Hatred, he brought with him, that ancient feuds between nations and peoples should be kindled anew, lest the earth forget its strife and men become as brothers;—and I said to myself, yes—I have seen this red horse too. More than once in my generation has his terrible tread caused the earth to tremble and the heavens to darken before his awful presence.

Only a few short years ago it was this horseman who halted our civilization, and turned holy things into things of horror, and men into beasts. Yes, I had seen them go. Long lines of silent, and suddenly bewildered men,—filing out from office, farm and mill to follow this fiery horseman into that awful cataclysm of world conflict, and the voice again whispered to me—"His name is *War*."

Then came a horseman seated upon a black steed; balances he bore, with which to measure the wheat, and barter with the widows and orphans; the war crippled, the maimed and the blind; for want and hunger were rampant in the land, though the tills were full and bursting with the gold that lies and cruelty had won. The nations of the earth were starving. The red horseman had done his work. And again the voice whispered to me, "The name of this horseman is *Famine*."

And then a pale horse appeared; upon him sat a pale rider; ruin and chaos followed him; and a pestilence of crime and cruelty swept over the earth; and great fear possessed the people. Power, and War, and Famine had done their deadly work of destruction, and while the thoughts and efforts of great and courageous souls now center upon some panacea that would heal this war-sick world, the pale horseman still rides; stampeding through the crowded ways of men. Yes—I have seen him. More than once in my generation he has passed, but never so sinister as at the present time. I listened—and the voice said to me "His name is *Death*."

"I have seen them all" I repeated to myself, as I closed the sacred book; but the voice whispered—"Not so. There is still another horseman. Long centuries he has been silent, for this seal was not to be broken in the vision on the isle of Patmos, but on the battle fields of France. It was in this great world-conflict that this horseman tested his prowess, while he drew into his nostrils the smoke and fire of the trenches. Men knew and feared him then, but few saw him as he is. This horseman—although wiser—is more cunning and more cruel than the others. With great wings he cleaves the clouds, laughing at the clumsy toys with which men play at war.

"Knowing the trait of the ancient Caesars, and the grip of gold on seats of power, the fifth horseman—ready and terrible—waits the command to ride."

"His name?" I asked, and the voice answered—*"Annihilation."*

ALICE MARSTON SEAMAN.

---

## The Blind in the Economic World

The general desire and striving for a better standard of living that has spread all over the globe in recent decades has been felt keenly by the physically blind, who are to be found more or less in all countries. In some parts of the world the great developments which have taken place among the ordinary population have also had some influence on the life of their blind community, but in many countries the condition of the blind is the same as it was a century ago. Why? Because the established human belief is the old traditional one that a blind person cannot do any useful work and has neither abilities nor wants. The general opinion is that the blind are either beggars or wise men. But the chief reason is that people don't know what blindness is—that it is not misery, but a handicap which can be overcome to a high degree. They don't know that the physical eye is a bridge only to the mind's eye, where the sense of seeing is really seated—that a man with healthy eyes sometimes goes through life without taking in what he sees at all, and that on the other hand a blind man is sometimes able to embrace the whole world with his mind's eye and thus sees more than many normal people do. Examples of how the senses of men can work without the use of the physical ear or eye are numerous. Think of Beethoven, the greatest composer of all time, who was utterly deaf when composing his greatest works. By the help of his ears he could not create these divine sounds and harmonies, but they were born in his mind's ear and from there went out into the world to give joy and pleasure to

millions of beings. With regard to blind persons, think of Milton, one of the greatest poets that ever lived; and Fawcett, the blind post-master general who was celebrated for his efficiency. Remember the deaf and blind Helen Keller; and read her books and you will judge for yourselves where the real sight of a human being lies. Blindness does not prevent a being from performing great work. It is the prejudice of those who see that quenches the strength and gifts of the blind. They think pity and charity the right means by which to treat the blind, instead of trying to obtain a real understanding of them and letting them take part in their own work and pleasure. They would soon find out how wrong their conception of blindness has been, how much pleasure they and the blind fellowman would gain from a mutual understanding. And the State would soon see that a blind person is able to be the same useful member of society as those who see. And how much they could save by giving the blind the opportunity to use their gifts!

The economic life of the blind has undergone three stages of development. The first derives from the classic centuries, when the blind were looked upon either as prophets or beggars. See the chorus in the drama Oedipus, "Rather dead than blind"; the wise man in "Julius Caesar" who prophesies doom in the play; the cruel treatment of the blind flowergirl in the novel, "The Last Days of Pompeii," by Bulwer Lytton; the long verse that Schiller sings about the misery of blindness in "Wilhelm Tell," etc. No wonder that those who see did not want the company of blind persons, lest they should be told some evil prophecies or asked for alms.

The second period was the result of this treatment. At the beginning of the 19th century a clever and humane Frenchman, Valentin H'aeu, went through the streets of Paris, where his attention was drawn to a show in the middle of a road. Some fancy-dressed men with paper spectacles on their noses and sheets with musical notations upside down in their hands were standing in a circle, each playing an odd instrument, and one going 'round and collecting money from the surrounding crowd who seemed to enjoy the joke immensely. Coming nearer H'aeu saw that the men were blind and that the collector examined each coin by the touch of his fingers. He was disgusted to see the blind misused in this way, and after some deliberation decided to devote himself to the cause of the blind. He took a young blind man under his care, taught him to read embossed letters by touch, and, being successful, taught more blind persons; and in this way founded the first institution for the blind on the European continent. Soon his splendid work was known and he was invited by the greatest rulers in Europe to come and consult about similar institutions in their countries. He went to Austria, Russia, and Germany; in this latter country, the first school for the blind was founded in 1806, inspired by this genial and philanthropic man. Since that time hundreds of institutions, schools, and workshops for the blind have been erected and developed all over the world. The blind get a more or less good school education at these places, and then they are trained in one of the typical industries for the blind, that is to say, brush—and basketmaking, chair-caning, piano-tuning, etc. In recent times machine-knitting and weaving have been added. After they have finished training, most of them enter a home, asylum, or workshop, where they live and work. Only exceptional ones among these workers can make a living by their work; most have to be supported throughout life and never become independent.

All this meant isolation from the outer world, no independence, the suppressing of many fine abilities and gifts which otherwise would be of great usefulness to the state and to society. In a few countries, as for instance England and the United States, the gifted blind had an opportunity of higher education, but looking for a post or office of a higher kind they had to fight strongly against the prejudice of men in all countries. The old tradition of regarding the blind as beggars had not vanished.

The third period, which began 1914, was most conspicuous in Germany, where the work done for the war-blind brought about a great change for thousands of the adult civilian blind, too. The war-blind could by no means be persuaded to go in for the typical industries of the blind, but wanted to take up their old work if possible, and at any rate not to be isolated from their families and friends.

An entirely new work for the blind was opened for these men in the factories. There they worked among their normal fellows, and could earn the same as these. The more educated ones were trained to do office-work, and obtained posts as typists and document-menders. The agricultural workers were trained in a specially established farm-school to do their work in spite of their blindness, got a little settlement and lived as they did before the war. The graduates studied on at the colleges, and got posts as clergymen, teachers, lawyers, and higher officials in state departments or municipal administrations.

When the civilian blind saw what the war-blind were able to do, they rose against their former condition and asked for training and placement of this same kind. There are several thousand blind men and women now working in factories not only in Germany but in many other countries as well. Even if it is not an ideal work, they feel happy to share their lives with their fellowmen, and are more independent than before. There are hundreds of typists and stenographers working in all kinds of offices—ministries, municipal administrations, private firms. They earn the same fees, are entitled to all social insurances, and compete successfully with their normal colleagues. This profession is a favorite one, as a blind typist who has been trained thoroughly and is fitted out with the suitable machines, is a welcome worker. At least this is the case now in Germany.

Not yet, however, are conditions as they should be. Still is it true that almost every blind person who wants work, or a post among the "sighted," has again and again to fight hard against the prejudice of his fellowmen. Even after the many good results are known, each blind person has to struggle anew. Sometimes employers, who do not know anything of the abilities of the blind, make the curious statement that there are so many normal people who want the work that there is no room for the blind—as if a human being because of his blindness had not the same right of existence as any other! This making the blind a lower class of being is what makes them unhappy—*not* their blindness!

If the world really wants to help the blind, as people so often and so loudly affirm they do, let men throw off their prejudice. You will help the blind best in this way. Forget the saying, "Pity the Blind!" Say rather, "Understand the Blind!"

BETTY HIRSCH.*

---

*NOTE: Miss Hirsch is a German Jewess. A blind woman, she became a noted teacher of the blind. She is now living in exile in England.—Editor.

# War and Women

(*From Our Geneva Correspondent*)

What is the attitude of mankind to war? Are there now more who support edifying, productive peace instead of destroying, killing warfare? It does not seem so. All big nations are trained for warfare. In Germany, Italy and Japan all endeavors for peace are suppressed. Those who do not want war are traitors to their country. War is the national aim.

In other countries they are still allowed to prefer peace. But there are no countries to be found which are not preparing for war. Some want it now, others want to wait, and those people who want it under no circumstances become fewer and fewer, except among the women.

Women look differently upon war. They have always done so. The old outworn ideas about the field of honor, heroic deeds and decorations for bravery can be glorified forever in the eyes of men. But women do not forget the other side. They see their husbands and sons maimed or dead. They see despair, privation, and a life of continuous toil, hunger and need for them and their children. And they see how the field of honor grows and spreads so that it will soon encompass the whole earth. The field of honor is no longer reserved for their sons and husbands. Their little children, their old parents, their sick and helpless are all included. The honor and glory in the coming war will be in striking more of them than the enemy succeeds in hitting in one's own country.

There used to be many who looked at war as women look at it. The entire Social Democratic Labor Party knew that it had nothing to gain by an imperialistic war. In August, 1928, Socialists and workers held an International Congress under the presidency of Henderson. In a resolution that was passed unanimously, it stated among other things:

> It is the duty of all Labor and Socialist parties . . . to ensure the exercise of the strongest possible—even the most revolutionary—pressure from the side of the masses upon every government that refuses to recognize or respect arbitration in an international conflict and resorts to war.

In 1928, Social Democracy had not yet omitted the general strike from its program. Since then, however, it has changed the signals.

The English Labor Party, for example, writes in its official organ, *War and Peace:*

> The foreign policy of the Party is based upon the system of collective peace. This system means the League of Nations, along with cooperation between the League and the states outside it.

And the leaders of the Party declare that they will support every war recognized by the League of Nations, and, as the Independent Labor Party says in its paper, the *New Leader,* this is the same as saying that the Labor Party will support the next war upon which the English government enters. The ruling of the League of Nations will hardly go against England. Thus, if they are asked and allowed to answer, they will scarcely hesitate to declare England's war to be a just war, necessary for England's defense.

In France, where the Socialists and Communists form a united front, the leader of the Social Democrats, Leon Blum, declared in favor of national defense. In Belgium, Vandervelde is willing to co-operate with the government for national unity and safety.

In the manifesto of the Social Democrats of Czecho-slovakia, passed at the congress in April, the policy of the League of Nations was approved and the Party assured the government of all necessary support for national defense. In Switzerland the Socialist paper *Le Travail,* writes that there is nothing else to do than to look to the League of Nations: "It is dangerous merely to lean out of the window of the League. One risks causing the whole to fall to pieces."

Social Democracy no longer sees the enemy in its own country. It has shifted him into that of its Fascist neighbor. It has put "national" upon its flag instead of "international." Where labor has not passed resolutions agreeing to relinquish the general strike as a means of preventing war, they have done so by gathering around the League of Nations which represents a dictatorship of imperialist governments whose interests are the direct opposite of those of Social Democracy.

While the great political labor parties have thus for the moment renounced international cooperation and no longer have the fight against war and Fascism on their programs, the word "war" having been rubbed out, both women and intellectuals have underlined it.

In Sweden, for example, there has been started a movement known as the women's unarmed revolt against war. Its first move is directed towards protection from gas. Here it has taken up the only right standpoint on a humane basis: We will not be protected if all cannot be protected! "If we save fifty out of a hundred, we are plentifully rewarded for our trouble," says the French General Superintendent for the protection of France. But which fifty shall be rescued, and which sacrificed? War is the most palpable acknowledgment of the rights of the strong and of the power of money. The poor and defenseless will be sacrificed while the rich are saved. This movement is to include all women who not only demand peace but also "another system for co-operation between peoples, and something to replace the old form of defense which," as the excellent Swedish paper for women, *Tidevaret* says, "is not even in a position to defend itself."

The French intellectuals place themselves even more directly in opposition to the above mentioned movement in the Social Democratic parties. In the appeal in their paper, *Vigilance,* it says: "Anti-Fascism can never justify any war. War is the final catastrophe. We refuse once and for all to believe it to be unavoidable. Only one form of anti-Fascism exists; it is the international solidarity between the anti-fascists of every country."

Men who want to protect their women and children have only one thing to do: *prevent war!* The medal for bravery that is worth getting is not earned by throwing bombs down upon other men, women, and children, but by opposing every government in one's own country that is preparing for war. This requires more courage than obeying orders, for it means going against the stream, the muddy, contaminating stream of Fascism and nationalism. It means being able to stand alone, and be strong.

ELLEN HOROP.

---

### Death Comes at Noon

And now—death comes at noon, on feet of steel
That crush in final agony our dreams of life and love—
Death in the sun and sand;
We who were strong and gay, and sang, shall sing no more—
Nor hold our naked babes in these brown hands;
All that is gone;
Gone with the whine of flying steel that cuts our dreams
To ribboned nightmares and drenches red the earth
With all our hopes—
"Ah, Madre! Madre mia! Glory!
"They didn't tell me *this* was War!"

HART WALKER.

# The Study Table

## Russia Today, What We Can Learn from It*

If any social order persistently denies intellectual culture, spiritual freedom, law and order, scientific discovery or social justice, it cannot endure.—*Sherwood Eddy.*

In recent years many books on Russia have been written by partisans of Communism and capitalism. These authors have either extolled Soviet Russia as the paradise on earth or they have denounced Soviet Russia as a menace to the civilized world. Dr. Sherwood Eddy in his work gives us a balanced survey of Russia today and what can be learnt from Russian experiments.

Dr. Eddy first points out the mistakes committed by Soviet Russia in suppressing Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Press, Freedom of Assembly and Freedom of Conscience and Religion, which are the great heritage of modern civilization and contributions of liberalism. Furthermore, Dr. Eddy denounces the policy of violence against political opponents, under the pretext of preserving the Revolution. But the eminent Christian leader (Dr. Eddy) is very anxious that the people in other lands should try to learn the best of the ideals and achievements of Soviet Russia, which is carrying on a vast experiment, based upon the ideals of social justice and social planning.

The experiments in Soviet Russia are based upon the political and social philosophy of Karl Marx, the advocate of dictatorship of the proletariet to be achieved through revolution. Dr. Eddy tries to fathom the fundamentals of Marxian doctrines and finds it to be impossible for him to agree with them. However he sees much good has been done in Russia by the Communist Revolution.

The Soviet Russian system is working for a "classless society" through economic planning. In this connection the author points out that there is no race prejudice in Russia whereas race prejudice is a very dominant feature of the Anglo-Saxon world. There cannot be a truly classless society unless we recognize racial equality. In this connection the author makes a very pertinent remark which should be carefully remembered by all students of modern history:

> The principle of racial equality is a powerful factor in challenging the imperialistic rule of the white race, over some seven-eighths of the planet (p. 68).

It may be noted that the success of Russian diplomacy in Asia, especially in Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan and even in China and Japan, was due primarily to the Russian policy of proclaiming racial equality and espousing the cause of the oppressed people of Asia.

Soviet Russia has set an example regarding the treatment of criminals, in spite of the fact that the Soviet system of justice is "class justice" and is merciless in dealing with their political opponents. According to Soviet leaders, crime is due to ignorance, economic pressure, physical or mental defect; therefore the treatment of criminals must not be vindictive but redemptive. Therefore education and special treatment of criminals form an interesting experiment. The masses of Russia must be raised from illiteracy to the stage of scientific enlightenment. Following this idea, much has been done towards educational progress of the country. In 1913 only 33 per cent of the people of Russia could read and write and in 1932 literacy in Russia was about 90 per cent. Similarly Russian industrial development during the last few years has been phenomenal. But the most remarkable feature of this success is that the ideal behind this is not profit but social justice. The author carefully discusses what has been achieved in Soviet Russia in the field of controlling unemployment, slum-clearing and revolution in agriculture.

In the chapter on "New Morality in Russia," the author compares the ideals of the capitalistic world with those of Soviet Russia and finds that from ethical points of view, the Russian ideal of morality is higher, because it puts into operation the ideal of service and removal of misery of man.

In the chapter on "Unified Philosophy of Life" (pp. 177-223), the author gives a lucid discussion on philosophical ideals of life and interpretation of history. The Greeks emphasized the importance of "freedom of thought," the Hebrews morality, the Romans gave us the ideals of Law and Order. The western world in recent years has made tremendous progress in scientific fields, but it has failed in the field of social justice, the ideal emphasized by Karl Marx and his disciples. The author presents an excellent summary of Marx's philosophy and points out that Marx himself said that

> Revolutions can never be created merely by a few agitators but are brought about by suppression of social wants by outworn institutions. (p. 213.)

* * *

> Revolutions are almost invariably destructive. They occur only when evolutionary progress to do justice is blocked by the class in possession and power, when the hard crust of status quo restrains molten lava of discontent until the volcano of revolution bursts into eruption. (p. 199.)

Those who are interested in stopping a violent revolution should know that by merely agitating against the agitators or revolutionists, revolutions cannot be stopped; but by conferring social justice to the oppressed the causes of revolutions may be removed.

Marx emphasized that economic forces are *chief factors* in determining human progress; but he never meant that men are mere machines or bound to fate. On the other hand Marx's idea was that man should become master of economic forces and thus become free. Dr. Eddy disagrees with Marx and opposes the idea that violent revolution is a certain necessity. To Dr. Eddy, the nature of reality is neither mechanistic nor organic, but super-organic.

In the chapter on "Reformation of Religion" (pp. 224-245) the author emphasizes that the organized religion (especially Protestant Christianity) has been a supporter of the possessing class, and thus has not aided the cause of social justice. Unless this attitude changes, the mere denouncing of godlessness of the communists will not help the cause of religion; because any religion (Christianity or other) which does not function to carry out social justice (*not charity*) is bound to be overthrown.

The author's conclusion is that we are at the end of an era. Change in the social order is bound to come. It may come without a violent revolution, if the possessing class makes the desired concession; otherwise there will be a revolution in various countries as in Russia. The spirit of history is "march towards Freedom." At the present time, the Communist State is presenting a new extreme thesis of "Class Struggle and Dictatorship of the Proletariet." This thesis is opposed by the anti-thesis of Fascism, aiming to maintain the

*Sherwood Eddy: Russia Today, What We Can Learn From It. Published by Ferrar and Rinehart. New York.

existing order and rule of the few of the possessing class, through a Dictator. The next step in human progress, towards Freedom, lies not in any one of these two extreme ideals of Communism or Fascism, but in a new synthesis which will be the outcome of the readjustment of these forces.

TARAKNATH DAS.

### Conquistador

Frank Hanighen, daring exposist of "Merchants of Death," turns a torrid pen upon Santa Anna, last of Conquistadors, scourge of Texas and Napoleon of the West—the result is a tumultuous, many-colored melodrama, through which the redoubtable dictator gallops his fiery way across an appointed stage, consolidating his country (at times), trampling its foes beneath his charger's hooves, at intervals of his overthrow by Sam Houston at San Jacinto, and elsewhere, *Daes Irae*. . . . A swiftly-moving, highly pictorial production, in fine, especially significant to readers in a Republic so heavily burdened with blame for Mexico's undoing: well worth all the attention we propose to bestow upon it.

Preluded by an ominous massacre of prematurely revolted Texans at the moment of Napoleon's downfall, instantly giving full stage to Santa Anna, Mr. Hanighen rushes his astounding drama upon its hectic way with true Latin fervor, showing us the youth and education of Attila; his sanguinary share in the Virgin's Revolt against Spain; the lordship of Augustin I; his overthrow before a republic raised on swords; Santa Anna, fantastic lover and country squire; *Pronunciamiento,* making him dictator and warlord of Vera Cruz; Mexico's "War of 1812," with Santa Anna her sword-arm; dominion and downfall of Bustamente; the presidency of Santa Anna; *Dictatorship;* revolted Texas and the crimson pyre that was the Alamo; Houston's summary vengeance at San Jacinto; an extended Calvary of captivity for Santa Anna; an interlude of French guns, shaking Mexican soil and enshrining our hero's leg for the ages; splendors of evanescent empery, followed by another downfall of this fantastic Caesar (and a desecrated Leg), puppet henceforth to the scheming Polk, who placed him upon the throne of Montezuma, only to see the wretched renegade turn that power against his benefactor, forcing the American to plunge these two western republics into thunderous war, out of which America emerged victorious, one mailed fist on the fallen chieftain, the other gorged with a slab of territory larger than modern Europe. The glamorous Stars and Stripes (if one may be permitted a little moralizing) have been used to cover many a deed of sordid skullduggery; but never in all history did they mantle any blacker outrage than this ravishing of Mexico—a piece of gratuitous villany amply avenged by the fratricide of 1861 over the looted soil and, with a few far-off dirges for our national honor, we may conclude this study of Hanighen's "Santa Anna," not without a backward glance at its hero: his vainglorious braggadocio, his sanguinary strokes, his demoniacal energy, his Napoleonic proclamations, his colossal dreams. A foaming, raging, pageant of empire, this story of Mexico's Napoleon, from its trumpet opening to its desolating close, with "Old Peg Leg" dethroned from his pedestal, a beggared outcast in his own land—across its vistas thunders the audacious Santa Anna, self-styled "Napoleon of the West," commanding a cast blazing with gold and scarlet, amongst which are Bustamente, Boswell of Revolution; Garat, veteran of Bonaparte; Stephen Austin; Davy Crockett; San Houston; Louis Phillipe; Andrew Jackson; Lee; Sherman; Davis; Grant; Beauregard; Maximilian of Austria; Napoleon III. At their head rides Conquistador, the indomitable Mexican dictator, with his "graceful form," his raven hair, his flashing eye, his grandiose style. Richly Rabelaisian in farce fantasy; hot and spicy with tortillas and tamales; beautiful with darksome jungles, Mayan temples, and silver-veined mountains; bright with swords, big with guns and sonorous with their speech, Mr. Hanighen's spectacle evokes before our eyes an almost legendary epoch and a taking, piquant personality, who dashes forcefully before us, regards us with defiant gaze, and then (like the great predecessor of his prototype) conquers us.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

"Santa Anna: the Napoleon of the West." By Frank C. Hanighen. Published by Coward McCann, 1934. $3.50.

## Correspondence

### UNITY'S Opposition to War

I

Editor of UNITY:

I am much interested in your front-cover editorial by Dr. Holmes, and think that he is right, although I also feel that we must generalize, and make international, not only our new Neutrality policies, but also our coming proposals for the definition of contraband. I also think that we ought to urge upon the nations an honest and just international administration of backward regions.

BRENT ALLINSON.

*Highland Park, Ill.*

II

Editor of UNITY:

Three rousing cheers for UNITY's valiant anti-war stand. It makes me proud and happy to write for you.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

*Chicago, Ill.*

### Some Reflections on the War Situation

Editor of UNITY:

With all deference to those who will oppose any support of the League sanctions against Italy, and with a sincere preference for peace, I still could not feel reconciled to a world in which a dictator, maddened by ambition, would be free to overrun a neighboring weak state, while strong neighbors refused to extend a restraining hand. I know there are many people who believe that all kinds of war are futile. They are justified in opposing all war. On the other hand, if our country's refusal to support a just cause were prompted by the desire to shirk responsibility and escape suffering, a lot of us would find little satisfaction in that course.

And when we say we will fight only if our country is invaded, are we consistent? By what reasoning is it right to defend ourselves and wrong to defend a weak neighbor?

The League of Nations may relieve us, happily, from the need to face that question. I have faith that if the League will in future strive to secure peaceful and just settlements, and will firmly insist upon such an ending to disputes, on pain of sanctions or even police force, we shall see an end to wars between nations. After Mussolini shall have been humbled, Great Britain herself will hesitate to flout a decision of the League. At least such is the hope of one who sees no other hope of a peaceful world in the near future.

Needless to say, the League's power to secure peace without the threat of force would be immeasurably strengthened if the United States were to become a member. Our chances of escaping future wars would be increased instead of lessened. Consider what doubtless would have happened if the thirteen Colonies had not formed "a more perfect union." The high spirit of our stalwart people and the richness of our natural resources would only have added to the strength of contending factions and warring states.

Americans who favor joining or at least supporting the League are not condoning the past course of England or any other League nation. Indeed, we ourselves have been as rapacious as any of them. The question is, are we and the other nations willing to chart a new course and cooperate in the advancement of peace and civilization and the suppression of war? Or is irresponsible nationalism to remain the creed of all countries? We needed organized society for the restraining of the rapacious individual and obviously we need international organization for the restraining of the rapacious nation.

If we are to delay action against impending wrong until all past wrongs have been righted we shall find ourselves in a morass. So far as my limited study has gone, the League proposals for settlement of disputes in the past have been fair, even if some League members have acted from ulterior motives. The proposals must be judged on their merit. The only American criticism I have seen of the League's proposals to Mussolini was that they were over generous. Since these were flouted, what other course was open to the League than the one it has taken? And what course is open to America except to give the League at least our moral support?

F. S. KINDER.

*Denver, Colo.*

---

### A Word to Mussolini

Editor of UNITY:

In 1915, while the World War was in full blast, a poem of unusual character was published in the *American Magazine* entitled *"Progress."* The author was Marshall South.

This poem is in four parts, each of the first three of which deals with the destruction of some ancient kingdom or empire, though each one had felt assured of survival and supremacy over the rest of the known world on account of its military conquests.

The fourth or last part pictures vividly the condition of the world at the time when the poem was written and predicts the ruin of civilization if the war should continue.

I give here the third part of this poem, which tells of the destruction of the Roman empire. It might be well if Mussolini could read it and take its lesson to heart.

*"Behold Our Progress!"* Hear the tramp of Rome—
Legion on legion on the stone-paved ways.
Clatter of chariots, tread of marching feet,
Standards ablaze beneath the morning rays.
Mistress of all the world from pine to palm
Art and adornment filched from every land.
Monarchs in chains behind her chariot wheels,
States that pay tribute to a conqueror's hand.
"Behold our progress and enlightenment!
We are the people, we shall surely stand."
*And speaking thus they passed.*
The broken pillars in the Forum lie,
And scattered fragments strew the circus floor,
The loathsome beggars cluster in the shade
Of walls whose echoes legions wake no more.
The brazen buckler turns no foeman's steel,
The short, keen sword no longer makes its thrust.
And all the empire that hailed Caesar Lord
Has crumbled, like its builders, into dust.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

---

## The Field

(*Continued from Page* 82)

set to pour his ideas into the minds of the American people is revealed by listing the Hearst newspapers and magazines. They are as follows:

*American Weekly*
*Chicago American*
*Detroit Times*
*Los Angeles Examiner*
*Los Angeles Herald-Express*
*New York Journal*
*Oakland Post-Enquirer*
*Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph*
*San Francisco Call-Bulletin*
*San Francisco Examiner*
*Seattle Post-Intelligencer*
*Albany Times-Union*
*Atlanta Georgian and Sunday American*
*Baltimore News and Post and Sunday American*
*Boston American and Sunday Advertiser and Record*
*Chicago Herald and Examiner*
*Milwaukee Wisconsin News*
*Milwaukee Sentinel*
*New York American*
*New York Mirror*
*Omaha Bee-News*
*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*
*Rochester Journal and Sunday American*
*San Antonio Light*
*Syracuse Journal and Sunday American*
*Washington Herald*
*Washington Times*

In addition to all this impressive list Mr. Hearst owns the following:

*American Druggist*
*American Architect*
*Town and Country*
*House Beautiful* (combined with *Home and Field*)
*Good Housekeeping*
*Cosmopolitan*
*Harper's Bazaar*
*Motor*
*Motor Racing*

Then there are the British Hearst owned magazines, *The Connoisseur, Nash's Pall Mall Magazine, Good Housekeeping,* and *Harper's Bazaar.* Not satisfied with the newspapers and magazines, Mr. Hearst in addition owns the *Hearst Metrotone News* and *Hearst Radio, Inc.,* with four stations plus four stations owned by the newspapers above mentioned. All this, with the various feature syndicates, cinema productions, etc., gives Mr. Hearst the greatest propaganda agency in the world. Through his newspapers, moving pictures and radio he is in a position to make and unmake governmental policies and the men who administer them. What a power he could be for righteousness if only he had the interests of the common people at heart!—*The Presbyterian Tribune.*

**Prominent Men Forecast Their Stand on War**

In answer to the question, *What will you do when America goes to war?* the following replies, among others, were received by *The Modern Monthly* and published in its June, 1935 issue. The statements which follow are extracts, the answers in most cases being much longer.

*Sidney Howard:*

"I don't know. I can think of nothing to do or say which does not seem thoroughly ineffectual."

*John Dewey:*

"Do my best first to keep the country out and then if it happens to keep out myself.

*John Haynes Holmes:*

"Everything possible to oppose the war and to persuade other people to oppose it. There can be no compromise on this issue on the part of the pacifists. In the last war, even extreme pacifists simply stated their opposition and refused support of the war but apart from this did nothing. When or if the next war comes along, we must not only refuse to support but get in the way and make ourselves real opponents of a war administration. I imagine this will mean going to prison, but why not?

*Archibald MacLeish:*

"I would do everything in my power to prevent the United States going to war under any circumstances. There is only one possible position against the menace of militarism—absolute hostility. Any other is romantic."

*Charles A. Beard:*

"I never cross a bridge till I come to it and have a look at it. If however I am called to fight for the promotion of oil interests in China, or the collection of defaulted bonds in Peru, they will have to come and get me."

*Robert Morss Lovett:*

"In case the United States goes to war, I shall take my stand on the Kellogg Pact, in which, by treaty having equal force with the Constitution, this country has renounced war as an instrument of national policy. I shall take no part myself and shall do my best to defend others who take a similar stand."

*Stuart Chase:*

"In the last war I registered as a conscientious objector, and this I would do again."

*Everett Dean Martin:*

"I do not know what I would do."

*Anonymous:*

"Protest and then raise potatoes."

*Reinhold Niebuhr:*

"I do not intend to participate in any war now in prospect. I take this position not on strictly pacifistic grounds, for I am not an absolutist, but simply because I can see no good coming out of any of the wars confronting us. The position of Russia on the one hand and of Germany on the other hand in any of these wars would not affect my decision."

*Sherwood Anderson:*

"The truth is—I don't know . . . I wish to God I were braver."

*James Truslow Adams:*

"What I would or would not do would depend on what I thought of the right or wrong of some specific war."

*Walter Lippmann:*

"I don't know how to cross that bridge till we come to the river and see what it looks like."

*Elmer Rice:*

"Go to jail probably, or get shot. I don't subscribe to the theory that there are good wars and bad wars."

*Lewis Mumford:*

"In so-called times of peace I fight this war animus; and I shall continue to fight it when war breaks out —even if the war itself be the less of two evils, and even if the issues compel me, momentarily, to participate in the war."


# IN A CHANGING WORLD

**ACTIVE MINDS CAN NOT AFFORD TO MISS THESE:**

**"Academic Freedom,"** by Granville Hicks, former professor at the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

**"The Security of the Investor,"** by former Judge John J. Burns, General Counsel of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

**"Civil Liberties,"** by Roger Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union.

**"The Oxford Group Movement,"** by Albert C. Dieffenbach, religious editor of **The Boston Transcript.**

**"Observations of New Germany,"** by Dale DeWitt, minister of the Unitarian Church, Hollis, N. Y.

**"The Ministers' Union of America,"** by Leon R. Land, leader of the Bronx Free Fellowship, and director of activities of the Community Church, New York.

**"Reform vs. Revolution,"** by Raymond B. Bragg, associate minister of the First Unitarian Society, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

**Introducing The Register To New Friends**

**The CHRISTIAN REGISTER**
**25 Beacon Street, Boston**

PLEASE enter my subscription at your Introductory Rate of 5 months for one dollar. I enclose check or currency.

*Name* .....

*Street* .....

*City* .....*State*.....

**A FULL YEAR FOR $3.00**

## Our Debt to the Radical

By John L. Elliott

The power of the radical is in the fact that his influence lies so near to action. And action has in it an element of finality that is often dreaded if it lies in new and untried fields. This very newness is sometimes feared. The inertia of established societies is proverbial. But it is not only inertia which must be overcome in the interests of progress. An established society gives to its members a dominant preoccupation with certain interests to the exclusion of others. The romance of individual money-getting has been a large part of the epic of America.

Now our present day radicals are calling attention to the fact that there is need not only for individual action, but social action, and social re-organization of a more thoroughgoing kind than has ever been tried. The significance of the numbers of the unemployed would never have been recognized if it had not been for the radicals; and it is more than probable that the needs of many millions, and the right even to existence, would never have been conceded, if attention had not been called to them by radical thinkers, whose thought and whose influence tend in the direction of action—first to the meeting of the immediate needs and then attention to the causes.

It is certain that if those possessing power in the cities, in the states and the nation had not been afraid of violence, even greater injustice would have continued than that which exists now.

If in the past adequate instruments for the establishment of justice had been in existence strikes would not have been necessary. But they did not exist, and therefore strikes have been an indispensable, however crude, element in establishing justice. Preoccupation with individual interests, as well as inertia, would have created a situation in which it would be impossible for civilization to exist. In this respect our debt to the radical can hardly be overstated.

However, in following them as a guide in the matter of remedying the evil the situation is different. He may be as onesided and narrow in his point of view as the conservative. He may be a person with a panacea, or he may have an economic, an educational, or a scientific theology as exclusive of the essential elements as any theology of the past. But these limitations and this narrowness, if he possesses it, should not blind us to his cause if that is just, and should not create opposition to action if that action is necessary.

Radicals like Samuel Adams and John Brown had a cause, even if the remedies which they advocated often needed scrutiny. It has been difficult for a man, stung to the quick with the sense of injustice, to be moderate; and the tragedy is that the passion for a certain kind of action has often aroused wilful stubbornness and a resort to violence by the representatives of the *status quo*. Passion has been met with passion. If we have a debt to the radical it does not necessarily mean that we should follow him. It certainly does not mean that we should oppose him with mere passion for the existing order. He should be met with understanding, not alone for himself but for his cause. If he stands for the relief of injustice and demands action, if his cause is right, his work is important, even if his methods may not be right. The radical should be met with understanding, understanding that will lead to action.

This has happened in America. Samuel Adams was followed by Washington, John Brown by Lincoln.

Perhaps there never was a time when violence, both among radicals and among reactionaries, was as prevalent in the world as it is today. The situation may lead to the greatest advance or the worst reaction that history has recorded. Which it will be depends on the way that the demand for change is met.

And there is one more debt that we should pay to the radical. In the vast majority of cases he has been the man who has had faith in people as over against the cynical, mechanistic theories of life and of human nature. He has stood not only for the rights of human beings, but for faith in human capacity and worth.—*The Standard* (N. Y.).


**The New Humanist**

**Editor, Raymond B. Bragg** **Managing Editor, Edwin H. Wilson**
**Published by the Humanist Press Association, Inc.**

**Remarkable Combination Offer!**

PHILOSOPHY AND THE CONCEPTS OF MODERN SCIENCE, by Oliver L. Reiser. Macmillan Co., 1935 ($3.50), and THE NEW HUMANIST, a bi-monthly journal ($1.50) —both for the reduced price of $3.00. *THE PRICE OF THE TWO* less than the regular price of the book itself ($3.50). Foreign and Canadian Price $3.25. On all orders add 25c to cover mailing costs.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

PART I
PHILOSOPHY AND THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Chapter
I. Idealism and Scientific Reality
II. Man and the Cosmos
III. The Crisis in Science
IV. Vision and Reality
V. Light, Logic and Physics
VI. Naturalism and the New Physics
VII. Emergence and Field Physics
VIII. Consciousness as a New Dimension
IX. The Religion of Light

PART II
PHILOSOPHY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Chapter
X. History and Ethics
XI. The Energetic Interpretation of History
XII. The Philosophy of Energetics
XIII. The Emergence of Cultural Patterns
XIV. Creative Morality
XV. The Social Objectives of Humanism
Index

In this important work, over 300 pages in length, the well-known author of *Humanistic Logic* outlines a philosophy of science in terms of its humanistic implications. Symbolic logic, the new physics, emergent evolution, gestalt psychology, the biological origins of religion—all these are integrated into a striking synthesis. The social and ethical suggestions presented by Dr. Reiser in his *Humanism and New World Ideals* are here carried to their logical conclusion.

*You cannot afford to be without this original work, here obtainable through an unprecedented combination subscription offer.* The journal and the volume may be sent to separate addresses.

**What John Dewey says about this new book:**

*"This is an ambitious effort . . . to harmonize the methods, general theory, and specific conclusions of science in a variety of fields, especially in relation to the conflicts and problems that exist in present human life in its immense variety of lines of action, interest and value. . . . Many a reader will lay down the book after reading it with gratitude for the comprehensive and vital ways in which human problems are stated, with the wealth of illustrative material, and for its continual suggestiveness."*

*From "Nature and Humanity" in the New Humanist for October, 1935.*

**In the October, 1935, issue of the New Humanist:**
**JOHN DEWEY "NATURE AND HUMANITY"**

"Humanism as Religious Instrumentalism".....Harold Scott
"The Scope of Natural Science".....Roger W. Holmes
"The Virtues of Learning Curves".....W. S. Taylor
"Race and Nationality".....M. Whitcomb Hess
"Southern Justice" (A lynching).....Charles Leanman
"Let Us Be Free".....L. M. Pape
"Cosmic Coddling" (review).....James Dahir
"Life Without Immortality" (review).....Raymond B. Bragg

Send Your Check or Money Order and Receive This Book and Subscription
The New Humanist Is Published Six Times a Year
Yearly $1.50.....Canadian and Foreign.....$1.75.....Per Copy 25c
**Room 1532, 330 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois**